

**STATUS REPORT TO THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR SUBMITTED BY THE
PARTIES TO THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

The Parties to the Collaborative Agreement, the Plaintiff Class, represented by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Ohio; the City of Cincinnati (CPD) and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) (collectively referred to as “the Parties” or “the Collaborative Partners”) submit this status report to the Independent Monitor, pursuant to Collaborative Agreement, paragraph 105.

December 5, 2005

Reporting Period: August 6 – November 5

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Community Problem Oriented Policing (Paragraph 29)	3
Mutual Accountability Evaluation	25
Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement	27
Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment	28
Citizen Complaint Authority	30
Miscellaneous	32
Appendix	33

I. INTRODUCTION

This Report is intended to advise the Independent Monitor as to the progress that the Parties have made during the reporting period of August 6, 2005 through November 5, 2005. The Independent Monitor oversees implementation of both the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City and the United States Department of Justice, and the Collaborative Agreement (CA) between the City, the ACLU, and the FOP. The MOA is appended to the CA and is enforceable solely through the mechanism of paragraph 113 of the Collaborative Agreement

The purpose of the Collaborative Agreement is to resolve conflict, to improve community-police relations, to reduce crime and disorder, to fully resolve the pending claims of all individuals and organizations named in the underlying litigation, to implement the consensus goals identified by the community through the collaborative process, and to foster an atmosphere throughout the community of mutual respect and trust among community members, including the police. The Parties recognize that there has been friction between some members of both the community and the CPD. The ultimate goal of the Agreement is to reduce that friction and foster a safer community where mutual trust and respect are enhanced among citizens and police.

Implementation will not only reform police practice, but will enhance trust, communication, and cooperation between police and the community. The City of Cincinnati continues to be enthusiastic and committed to this endeavor.

This report provides updates based on the following established committees to fully address each area stipulated in the Agreement:

- Community Problem-Oriented Policing Committee
- Mutual Accountability
- Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement
- Fair, Equitable, and Courteous Treatment
- Citizen Complaint Authority Committee

II. COMMUNITY PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING

Item 29(a). The City, in consultation with the other Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate City departments with the CPOP focus of the CPD.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor believes that the new, separate city service tracking system (CSR) will be a benefit to police and citizen problem solvers and the link that will be established between the revised CPOP tracking system and the CSR can facilitate interagency collaboration. We look forward to seeing the system on line.¹

As we noted in prior Reports, the Monitor's assessment of compliance requires documentation of the City's implementation of its coordination plan. This can include the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation (including the work of the Neighborhood Code Enforcement Response Teams), and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem.

Based on a review of the CA Status Report, the Monitor finds that the City is in partial compliance.

Status Update

The Cincinnati Area Geographic Information System (CAGIS) continues to work on the Customer Service Response system which is designed to provide a link between City Departments. The focus, as of this report, has been on Health, Fire, and Buildings and Inspections. Once all departments are online with accessibility to CSR and the CPOP/SARA application, documentation of multi-departmental problem solving will be realized. Detailed workflows between all of the departments can then be tracked online.

NCERT teams have been utilized in the following initiatives:

District 1

1. The Vine Street Lab Project (highlighted in the Annual Report)
2. Project at 1300 Walnut Street to identify the problem
3. Project at 1519 Republic Street involving Buildings and Inspections
4. Project at 1010 York Street

¹ We report on improvements proposed to the CPOP tracking system in 29(m).

5. Clean-up project at 547 Findlay Street with specific assistance from the Health Department.

Item 29(b), the Parties shall develop and implement a system for regularly researching and making available to the public a comprehensive library of best practices in community problem-oriented policing.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Again, the Monitor compliments the Parties for their collaboration on a comprehensive library. The CPOP library may be the most comprehensive web library on a police department website. The Parties have been in compliance with this section for five consecutive quarters.

As we have noted in prior reports, section 29(b) is also related to sections 29 (c) and (d). We believe that compliance for 29(c) and 29(d) will require training within the CPD of some of the 29(b) best practices, as well as their use in crime reduction efforts. Towards that end, we recommend that the CPD broaden dissemination of the best practices library to all officers, not just CPOP officers (adding it to the CPD's website is one way to do this).

With the work of the Parties and the Partnering Center in developing the virtual best practices library and making these publications available in hard copy through the Hamilton County Library, the Monitor finds the Parties to be in compliance with CA ¶29(b).

Status Update

The Community Police Partnering Center has reviewed and organized the "Best Practices" library on the CPOP website. This update provides easier review and access to the publications.

See Appendix Item #1.

In response to the Monitor's suggestion to post the "Best Practices" library on the CPD website to make it accessible to all officers, we would like to point out that the CPOP website *is* accessible to all officers. Therefore the CPD does not see the need to post the library in both places. The CPD is looking forward to the finalization of the CPOP Compliance Standards, which will hopefully resolve what constitutes compliance with this requirement.

Item 29(c). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop a process to document and disseminate problem-solving learning experiences throughout the Police Department and the public.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor applauds the effort made this quarter. It represents an increase in commitment to training around CPOP. We believe that the training undertaken in the last two quarters is a good first step towards introducing Department employees to CPOP, including employees outside the COP unit. We believe the CA requires that the CPD prepare and schedule additional training opportunities for its employees to underscore its commitment to CPOP as the principal policing strategy of the CPD.²

With respect to documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences in the field throughout the CPD, we believe that the roll call bulletin is an excellent start, but is not sufficient by itself to meet compliance. The bulletin is well done and contains a well-constructed problem-solving project.³ Since the bulletin will only be used one day, we believe that the CPD must quickly pick up the pace of documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences. Similar one-page write-ups of other problem-solving efforts that have undergone some evaluation can be disseminated in other ways, for example through the Blue Wave, the Department's new newsletter, or in Staff Notes, which go out to all Department employees. If problem solving efforts undertaken by CPD have not yet been evaluated, then CPD can draw on problem-solving efforts from other departments and share them as a basis of discussion among officers and units about types of problems CPD employees can undertake.

As for public accessibility of problem-solving efforts, the CPD's problem-solving descriptions remain accessible to the public via internet on the CPOP website. As mentioned earlier, the problem-solving descriptions contained in the CPOP website tracking system will migrate to the new system and will be updated with additional details to conform to the format of the new system. The CPD is in compliance with the public dissemination requirement of this subsection.

Concerning the emphasis on problem solving throughout the CPD, we are heartened to see the additional training that has occurred and hope to see the inclusion of CPOP in many more of the training sessions the CPD presents, as required by the CA. But to date, the CPD is not in compliance with this subsection requirement. The roll call training should supplement, but not

² The Monitor anticipates attending some of the CA training in upcoming quarters.

³ The photographs of the Kennedy Heights Bumping the Bridge effort provide a wonderful visual description of one of the responses applied in that project.

supplant more intensive training that covers the fundamentals of problem solving and the role each person in the organization has in it.

In earlier Reports, we noted that 29(b), (c), and (d) are linked. These and other CA sections are meant as ways to facilitate the adoption of problem solving as the CPD's principal strategy to reduce crime and disorder in Cincinnati. We have found the Parties in compliance with the public dissemination requirements under 29(b) and (c). However, because problem solving is to be adopted as the "principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems," the portions of 29(c) and (d) that deal with training and dissemination within the Department require fuller efforts, as they are meant as a way to effectuate significant change in the organization. We have determined that the City is in partial compliance with the requirements of 29(c) for training and dissemination to CPD members. This applies for 29(d) as well.

Currently, of the four subparts to this subparagraph, the Parties are in compliance with the public dissemination requirement. Progress on the other elements of this CA section is required. The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

In-service training for non-sworn CPD members was conducted August 22 through October 19, 2005. Mr. S. Gregory Baker and Lieutenant Colonel Cindy Combs participated in the training by providing an update on the Collaborative and MOA Agreements. New supervisors' training conducted during this reporting period covered various topics including CPOP, problem solving, and the CCA. View the complete list of topics in Appendix Item # 2.

As part of the continuous learning process within the CPD, thirteen police officers attended the 16th Annual Problem-Oriented Policing Conference in Charlotte, North Carolina. The conference was held October 21 – October 23, 2005. Attendees relayed positive comments about the conference and gained additional insight into problem-solving experiences from other agencies.

In addition, a four day training session on *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design* (CPTED) was held on October 5 and 6, 2005 for police, citizens, and partnering center staff. Upcoming sessions are scheduled for November 22 and 23, 2005. Additional information on these training will be reported in the next quarterly status report to the Monitor.

Also, the Police Relations Section continues to work with Police Academy staff on future Roll Call Training Bulletins to help disseminate problem solving experiences throughout the Department.

The FOP has suggested that in order to assure that all sworn members of the CPD receive identical training relating to CPOP, a five minute video be prepared for dissemination to all units of the CPD, to be viewed by all members of the CPD.

Item 29 (d), The Parties shall research best practices on successful and unsuccessful methods of problem-solving used by other professionals (e.g. conflict resolution, organizational development, epidemiology, military, civil engineering and business).

Monitor's Previous Assessment

We noted in our last Report that the sharing of gun violence reduction strategies is an excellent start, and we believe the Parties' inclusion in a violence reduction initiative is also a positive step.

In addition, like the CPD, we are hopeful that the newly revised tracking system will elicit more detailed information from users and spur users to look at other problem solving efforts or manuals and guides when undertaking a project. We believe the new system holds great promise.

As we noted in last quarter's Report, the following developments would demonstrate compliance with 29(d): research is used in problem solving projects (see 29b); projects apply situational crime prevention if appropriate (the CA specifically mentions situational crime prevention); projects that are on POP Guide topics show awareness of the guide and its elements; research is used in crime reduction and traffic problem reduction efforts; best practice knowledge is used as a skills measure in the performance evaluations. The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Status Update

"The Ohio Service for Crime Opportunity Reduction (OSCOR) is dedicated to reducing crime throughout the state of Ohio. This service is sponsored and funded by the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services."⁴ Four Cincinnati neighborhoods, Avondale, Evanston, Pendleton, and West Price Hill, were analyzed. The following is a list of the projects that have been released:

- *Open-Air Drug Dealing in Cincinnati, Ohio: Executive Summary and Final Recommendations*
(<http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20RECOMMENDATIONS.pdf>)
- *Avondale Crime Reduction Project*
(<http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/AVONDALE.pdf>)

⁴ <http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/>

- *Evanston Crime Reduction Project*
(<http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf>)
- *Pendleton Crime Reduction Project*
(<http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/PENDLETON.pdf>)
- *West Price Hill Crime Reduction Project*
(<http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/W%20PRICE%20HILL.pdf>)
- *University Student Crime Prevention Awareness Project Evaluation*
(<http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20REPORT%20CRIME%20PREVENTION%20AWARENESS%20PROJECT.pdf>)

In addition to the above projects, the CPPC analyst also released his assessment, *Drugs and Violence In Over-the-Rhine: An Assessment of Responses Targeted At 12th St. and Republic St.* See Appendix Item #3 to view this document.

Item 29(e). The Parties, consistent with the Community Partnering Program, shall conduct CPOP training for community groups, jointly promote CPOP and implement CPOP training.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Partnering Center and the CPD participated in a number of co-hosted trainings this quarter, both SARA training and problem-specific training. We also see the training for the social service workers as a significant step in trying to bring to the table another valuable resource, since some problems are beyond the scope of city workers, the community, and the Partnering Center to address. The training now provided around specific crime/disorder problems is an example of the creativity that problem solving can lead to when used regularly. We look forward to observing additional training of this type that is being planned. The Parties should be extremely proud of what has been accomplished under this section of the CA. These joint endeavors hold great potential for the success of the CA.

The Parties are in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

During this reporting period, the CPPC held several "issue-specific" trainings and trained stakeholders new to CPOP in basic SARA methodology. Outreach continued in several neighborhoods to enlist residents to participate in CPOP efforts. The following list highlights the CPD/CPPC's training efforts:

- *Court Watch Training*
 - CPPC staff member, Valerie Brown-Green, coordinated with Terry Cosgrove of the Law Department and presented two sessions,

September 28, 2005 and October 13, 2005, to eleven Millvale citizens.

- Residents from Walnut Hills and East Walnut Hills attended training on September 1, 2005.
- *SARA Training*
 - The CPPC partnered with the CPD on August 23, 2005 to host training for residents from Walnut Hills and East Walnut Hills. The training was held at the Walnut Hills branch of the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County. Coincidentally, this branch joined the Main branch and Price Hill branch as a storehouse for CPOP “Best Practices”. Additional resources are also available to assist these neighborhoods in their ongoing problem solving efforts.
- *Corryville Student Police Academy*
 - The Friars Club / Corryville Family Resource Center (CFRC) sponsors this event designed to build relationships between urban teens and police. The CPPC and the CPD’s Training Section participated in this event on September 17, 2005.
 - The CPPC provided financial assistance in the form of a grant to assist with transportation costs for the fourteen youth involved. Food and t-shirts were also provided.
 - The day-long event included:
 - A presentation by Hamilton County Coroner, Dr. Odell Owens
 - An anti-gang and anti-drug presentation/discussion
 - A role-play and discussion about what to do if stopped by the police
 - A discussion about the importance of education and career opportunities
 - The CPPC staff conducted a survey of participating youth. The focus of the survey was on their perception of crime and safety at school, home, in Corryville, and in Cincinnati. The results of the surveys have since been analyzed and a report has been completed by CPPC’s analyst.
- *Hispanic Community Resources Training*
 - An outreach worker from the CPPC and a CPD sergeant in District Three to host training for Hispanic residents. The event was held at Holy Family School in Price Hill on September 17, 2005.
 - The focus of the training was to provide resources to the Hispanic community such as:
 - What to do if stopped by the police
 - How to decrease the risks of becoming a victim of crime
 - How to recognize and avoid scams involving prostitutes
 - Several individuals joined in the effort:
 - Sr. Brenda Busch, principal of Holy Family School

- Teresita Lewis and Pam Dixon, Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME)
 - Gladys Bell, Santa Maria
 - City of Cincinnati Health Department
- Thirteen residents, representing various Latin American countries, attended the event. Participants, who ranged in age and gender, were receptive to the information. Some said that more people would have come but were “unsure of the motives of the police department.” However, participants also stated that they felt comfortable, found the session to be helpful and informative, and would bring others to any subsequent training.
- Based on the specific feedback, there are plans to provide follow-up training.
- *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)*
 - Four day training for police, citizens, and partnering center staff was organized and funded by the CPPC. The first two sessions was held on October 5 and 6, 2005 with upcoming sessions scheduled for November 22 and 23, 2005. The training is being held at the Tri-State Regional Community Policing Institute (RCPI), a formal friend of the Collaborative. The RCPI donated the facility for the training and provided lunch for participants.

The training sessions are facilitated by internationally renowned CPTED experts, Greg Saville and Anna Brassard. The training is designed to teach participants how to minimize opportunities for crime that may be facilitated by the design of buildings, neighborhoods, and public spaces.

Participants broke into teams of a police officer, a CPPC staff member, and a citizen to work on a CPTED project. In an effort to “learn by doing”, members apply learned principles to real world situations. Teams will present their CPTED projects during the November session.

The CPPC continues to host a two hour show on Cincinnati’s WDBZ, 1230 AM – “The Buzz.” in an effort to promote CPOP and the Partnering Center.

- *August 6, 2005* – Live broadcast from the College Hill Festival which included members of the College Hill Forum, Citizens on Patrol, and the principal of Aiken High School.
- *August 19, 2005* – Live broadcast from the Jay Street Market event in Avondale
- *August 27, 2005* – In-studio discussion featuring the role of the Citizen Complaint Authority and the ACLU in the Collaborative Agreement

As of the end of this reporting period, CPPC outreach workers are engaged in active⁵ or developing CPOP efforts in 36 neighborhoods.

- Active 19⁶
- Developing 17⁷

Item 29(f). The Parties shall coordinate efforts through the Community Partnership Program to establish an ongoing community dialogue and interaction including youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low-income residents and other City residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA. Full compliance with this provision would entail a plan for structured dialogue, joint promotion of events and a review of the feedback from those events. It would also demonstrate compliance if the Parties scheduled follow-up meetings, and reported on the outcomes of the discussions and meetings, descriptions of areas of agreement and disagreement in the dialogue, and next steps.

Status Update

As of this report, the Parties have not developed an organized plan for community dialogue with the Community Police Partnering Center. The CPPC has a board retreat planned for November 1st and November 9th at which time each of the Parties will be present and ready to discuss a communications plan. Although the Parties, to date, have not developed a formalized communications plan, there have been numerous dialogues in various forms with community members.

In August, members of the Plaintiffs' team staffed a booth at the annual Black Family Reunion at Sawyer Point. This event offered, again, the opportunity to meet numerous members of the class and provide them, both through verbal and written material, updates regarding the CA and MOA.

In October, the Parties organized a meeting to allow members from the RAND Corporation to address community leaders about their evaluation work. This

⁵ "Active" status indicates that a CPOP team has identified a problem, submitted the appropriate paperwork to the District, and is in the process of a working through the SARA process to address the problem.

⁶ This includes the 25 *Cities Initiative* work in three neighborhoods: Kennedy Heights, Lower Price Hill, and Madisonville

⁷ Six neighborhoods (Corryville, CUF, East End, Hartwell, Millvale, and OTR) are either in the process or likely to transition to active status this year.

meeting brought together persons from a wide spectrum of community organizations and city government personnel. The Parties' plan is to continue the discourse with these and other community members once the final draft of the first annual report is published.

Item 29(g). The Parties shall establish an annual award recognizing CPOP efforts of citizens, police, and other public officials.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The judging guidelines show that a lot of hard work went into preparing for the annual CPOP Awards and we expect that deserving projects and groups will be honored through the process.

With approximately 22 active CPOP neighborhood teams, an awards ceremony recognizing the committed efforts of those engaged in problem solving will be a timely addition. Members of the Monitor Team hope to attend the Awards Ceremony to help honor the awardees and the joint accomplishment of the Parties. Once the awards program has been held, the Parties will be in compliance with this section of the CA. The Parties are in partial compliance with this CA requirement.

Status Update

The first annual Community Problem Oriented Policing Awards Banquet was held on October 27, 2005 at Xavier University in the Cintas Center. The CPPC was the primary sponsor of the event in conjunction with Hardin, Lefton, Lazarus, and Marks and Herb Brown, the Partnering Center Board President.

There were approximately 245 people in attendance including more than 70 Cincinnati Police personnel: Police Chief Thomas H. Streicher, Jr.; Assistant Police Chiefs Richard Janke, Cindy Combs, and Michael Cureton; S. Gregory Baker, Manager of Police Relations, and four of the five District Commanders as well as other Command Staff personnel.

Award recipients as well as those who received "special recognition" are listed below. Additionally, three Friends of the Collaborative received recognition for their support of the Collaborative Agreement and CPOP efforts.

Award Recipients

Outstanding Community Efforts in CPOP

- Lower Price Hill CPOP Team
- Pleasant Ridge Safety and Quality of Life Committee
- Northside CPOP Team

Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP

- I. Police
 - a. Sergeant Maris Herold
 - b. PO LaDon Laney
 - c. PO Terry Windeler
- II. Individual
 - a. Ben Pipkin, Kennedy Heights
 - b. Amos Robinson and Dorothy Harris, College Hill
 - c. Tori Houlihan and Dave Henry, Northside
- III. Organizations
 - a. Tender Mercies, Over-the-Rhine
 - b. Sanat Maria, Lower Price Hill
 - c. District Four Neighborhood Unit

CPOP Partnering Award

- Northside CPOP Team

CPOP Innovation Award

- Kennedy Heights CPOP Team, “Bridge Bumps”

Comprehensive CPOP Initiative Award

- Madisonville CPOP Team

Special Recognition for CPOP Efforts

- Evanston CPOP Team
- PO Steve Ventre, District Three
- PS Terry Cox, District Three
- Prencis Wilson, Madisonville

Friends of the Collaborative Awards

- Community Action Commission
- Women’s City Club
- Regional Community Policing Institute

Winners were featured on the October 29, 2005 radio show, “The Buzz”, WDBZ 1230 AM. Several people called in to comment on how much they enjoyed the CPOP Banquet. Since the event, the CPPC has received numerous comments, emails, and phone calls from citizens, police officers, and agency representatives sharing their appreciation of the work put into the event by the CPPC and the Parties to the CA. Additionally, one attendee made the following comment in an email:

“...[Partnering Center Executive Director Rick Biehl] really should know what a great event you all put together. It is the first time in a long time I have seen so many diverse persons sitting in the same room together and not shouting at each other. I think we only have begun what is possible, only seen the tip of the iceberg as it were, and there is so much to do if we only have the patience, resources, willpower, and courage to do what needs to be done.”⁸

⁸ Excerpt from an email received by the CPPC from a citizen.

See Appendix Item #4 for additional details about the event.

Item 29(h). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a system for consistently informing the public about police policies and procedures. In addition, the City will conduct a communications audit and develop and implement a plan for improved internal and external communications.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Concerning the first part of this CA section, accessibility to policies and procedures, they remain available to the public on the CPD's website, <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/cpd>. The City is in compliance with this part of paragraph 29(h). There is also a link in the City's CPOP website (<http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/>) to the CPD's procedure manual. The link provides access to community members who are engaged with the police through CPOP involvement. We believe that this sends a signal to the Cincinnati public of an increased willingness to create more transparent police operations, which is essential to building trust in the community.

Concerning the second part of this CA section, the City conducted a communications audit, but the plan for improved internal and external communications is still not developed, although there is a scope of services outlined in expectation of hiring a Community Relations Coordinator.

The City is in partial compliance with this component of paragraph 29(h). The Monitor hopes to review a draft of the communications plan and meet with the community relations coordinator, when that person is brought on board.

Status Update

The communications plan *is* in effect with the assistance of Hollister, Trubow, and Associates. The Parties respectfully refer the Monitor back to our September 2005 status report,

“The communications plan for improved internal and external communications is comprised of a scope of services to be implemented primarily through the Community Relations Coordinator.”⁹

See Appendix Item #5 to view the scope of services plan; minutes from the Internal Communications Council Meetings (August, September, and October); and the second edition of the *Blue Wave* newsletter.

⁹ CA Status Report to the Independent Monitor, September 5, 2005, p. 18.

Item 29(i). The CPD will create and staff a Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City is in compliance with this CA requirement.

Status Update

The Police Relations Unit is staffed, effective, and fully operational.

Item 29(j). The Parties shall describe the current status of problem-solving throughout the CPD via an annual report. Each party shall provide details on what it has done in relating to its role in CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

In the Annual Report, the Parties are asked to document problem-solving efforts that reflect CPOP training and best practices, specific problem definition, and in-depth analysis, an exploration and range of solutions, and assessment. The Parties should also describe continuous learning by CPD around problem solving and best practices, and identify problem solving training needs within the CPD and the community.

This year's Annual Report, the highlights of which are included in Appendix 3, documents the progress the Parties achieved collaboratively and individually. The efforts undertaken this year are the result of significant hard work. They reflect tremendous success and can be a source of inspiration for Cincinnatians. Although disagreement between the CPD and the Monitor over access and compliance dampened the level of cooperation for a period of several months this year, the work on the ground by CPD officers, the Partnering Center Staff, and the ACLU continued to keep CPOP active, and once the Court resolved the disagreement, it is clear that the pace of change and CPOP-related activity increased significantly. The Monitor is impressed with how much was ultimately accomplished and of the increasing quality of the initiatives undertaken by the Collaborative partners. We believe that the Annual Report offers the citizens of Cincinnati proof that change is not only possible, but an effective way to increase the level of trust and crime reduction skills of both citizens and the police. The Parties are in compliance with 29(j).

Status Update

The annual report was published August 2005. The report has been well received by the Monitoring Team, the Parties, as well as members of the community. Copies of the Annual Report continue to be disseminated locally and nationally.

Item 29(k). The CPD Commanders shall prepare quarterly reports that detail problem-solving activities within the Districts. Reports shall identify specific problems and steps taken by the City and community toward their resolution. Reports shall identify obstacles faced and recommendations for the future. Reports should be available to the public through the Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The number of Unit Commander quarterly reports increased this quarter.¹⁰ Based on our conversations with the CPD, we believe we will see greater detail in the next quarter's reports. The new tracking system should provide a clearer outline for officer reports, although some Unit Commanders may have to submit their reports without the help of the tracking system, because the new system will be loaded only on COP computers, at least initially.

This quarter, a number of the problem-solving reports were more descriptive of identified problems than prior quarterly write-ups, and we recognize this as an improvement. We will continue to work with the CPD on improving the reporting. This quarter showed great progress.

We noted in prior Reports that compliance with this CA provision will be demonstrated more clearly when all of the District and Unit Commanders prepare quarterly reports, and the reports reflect: an increasing use and proficiency in problem solving in the unit; a greater reliance on analysis and less reliance on unevaluated efforts; a wide range of tactics – civil, situational crime prevention, zoning, environmental, etc.; and the reports describe the Unit Commanders' actions and plans to involve the entire command in problem-solving and CPOP activities, rather than just the COP officers.

The CPD is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

¹⁰ In January 2003, the Monitor advised the City that it would expect quarterly problem-solving reports from special unit officials in Street Corner Narcotics, Vice, Planning, Crime Analysis, and Criminal Investigations Section (covering activities of homicide, personal crimes, major offenders, financial crimes units), Youth Services, Downtown Services Unit, Special Services Section (covering park unit, traffic unit), as well as the District Commanders. The Monitor requested this because problem solving, under the CA, is a Department-wide approach to addressing crime. As we noted in our prior Reports, these units are integral to CPOP success. In prior Reports, we also noted that each of the units should include individual reports about specific crime/safety problems.

Status Update

CPOP cases can be reviewed at the CPOP website, <http://192.168.100.200/cpop/review/caseinfo.aspx>. Also, the following is a list of those units who submitted quarterly problem solving reports as well as a brief description of this quarter's highlights.

See Appendix Item #6.

➤ District Commanders

○ District 1

- CPOP040009: Drug Sales at 12th St. and Republic – Assessment (Analysis/Assessment document in Appendix Item #2)
- CPOP040027: Drug Sales and Unlicensed Rooming Houses on Dayton St. - Assessment
- CPOP040044: Environmental Defense at 547 Findlay St. – Assessment Concluded, Case Resolved
- Main Street CPOP: Litter, Theft from Autos, and Disorderly Behavior in Goetz Al. – Response
- Pending: Drug Sales, Loitering, and Gun Violence at 1300 Walnut St. - Scan

○ Downtown Services Unit (DSU)

- Pending: Panhandling at 5th St. and Central Ave. – Scan

○ District 2

- CPOP040017: Loitering at 5810 Madison Rd. – Response
- CPOP040028: Drug Trafficking at 3244 Fairfield Ave. – Response
- CPOP040029: Drug Trafficking at 3400 Woodburn Ave. – Response
- CPOP040038: Drug Trafficking at Kennedy and Northdale - Response

○ District 3

- CPD Project: Abandoned buildings at 3221 Price Ave - Assessment
- CPD Project: Loitering, littering, and abandoned buildings at West Liberty St. and Iliff Ave. - Assessment
- CPD Project: Parking violations at 6700 Home City Avenue (Sayler Park School) – Assessment
- CPD Project: Graffiti at 3725 Beekman St (Wayne Park) - Assessment
- CPD Project: Speeding between 3400 and 3700 Epworth Ave. - Assessment

○ District 4

- CPD Project: Drug Activity at 2355 James Ave. – Response
 - CPD Project: Prostitution at 68th St. and Vine St. - Response
 - District 5
 - CPOP040042: Vacant Buildings and Drug Activity at Fergus St. and Apjones St. – Response
 - CPOP050013: Loitering and Drug Activity at 5804 Hamilton Ave to 5900 Hamilton Ave. and 1320 Cedar Ave. to 1555 Cedar Ave. – Assessment
 - CPD Project: Drug Activity and Prostitution at 3244 Central Parkway – Response
 - CPD Project: Robberies west of Vine St. to Ravine and between Calhoun St. and Klotter St. – Response
 - CPD Project: Thefts from Autos at 5100 Colerain Ave. - Assessment
- Central Vice Control Section
 - StreetCorner Unit
 - CPD Project: Operation Buyer Beware - Response
- Criminal Investigations Section (CIS)
 - Major Offenders Unit
 - Financial Crimes
 - CPD Project: Identity Theft - Assessment
 - Cold Case Fugitives - Assessment
 - Crime Stoppers - Assessment
 - Project Disarm - Assessment
 - Victim / Witness Protection Program - Response
 - Personal Crimes
 - Web Wise Kids – Response
 - Sexual Offender Monitoring Program - Response
- Special Services Unit
 - Park Unit
 - CPD Project: Thefts from Autos in Burnet Woods Park, 290 Burnet Woods Dr.
 - Youth services
 - CPD Project: Parking / Traffic at Kilgour School, 3401 Edwards Rd. – Response
 - Traffic Unit
 - CPD Project: Vehicular Crashes Citywide – All phases of SARA

Item 29(l). The Parties shall review existing Police Academy courses and recommend new ones in order to effectively and accurately inform police recruits, officers, and supervisors about the urban environment in which they work.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

If the Collaborative Agreement training is held again by the CPD, we believe it is very important for the Plaintiffs to attend. This training is a direct outcome of the CA and is responsive to a number of CA provisions. For compliance with this CA provision, we look for the Parties to review and consult on curricula, the Partnering Center to participate in CPD training, and for the FOP, Plaintiff and the Partnering Center to make recommendations on training and the CPD to consider and respond to those recommendations. The FOP's recommendations to the CPD for additional training on specific topics place the Parties in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

In March 2005, the FOP suggested the following training:

- 1) With respect to training for the entire department, as well as recruits, more emphasis should be placed on informing members of the CPD of the liabilities they face when they are named as defendants in their individual capacities, as well as their right to legal representation from outside the City Solicitor's office. This training should be conducted by attorneys who are not city employees in order to assure that matters of conflict of interest are fully disclosed.
- 2) If there should be any changes made to the current procedure involving the use of tasers, there should be full training on those changes before the new procedure goes into effect. Again, there should be training in the risks involved in the use of the taser in a manner contrary to the new procedure, which should include legal liability. The legal aspect of the training should be conducted by attorneys who are not city employees.
- 3) With respect to data collection and analysis, surveys of police officers and the community should include questions relating to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Citizen Compliant Authority investigations. It is not appropriate to conduct surveys relating solely to investigations by the CPD. Officers and citizens alike should be permitted to express their opinions relative to ALL INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES.
- 4) More training should be directed toward search and seizure, as well as when it is appropriate to charge a person with Disorderly Conduct and Obstruction of Official Business. The number of lawsuits against the police with respect to improper investigations and arrests involving those three areas reflect a need for more specialized training.

The CPD's Training Section is currently reviewing the FOP's suggestions for potential implementation. Also, the FOP now has a representative on the Training Committee.

The Plaintiffs are currently reviewing many of this fall's Academy training courses and have nothing to report at this time but will make recommendations in the next status report.

Item 29(m). The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem-tracking system.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Improvements to the problem-tracking system are a positive advance. The Community Relations Unit and CAGIS have worked extremely hard to revamp the system and offer officers, the Partnering Center, and COP members a more advanced system. We believe that the system, like any system, will only be as good as the information inputted. We are hopeful that the CPD will work diligently with its supervisors so they can mentor their officers in using the system effectively. Doing so will add precision to the problem-solving projects and help advance the Department's knowledge base about problem locations. With any new system there may be hiccups initially, and in fact the officers using the system may need additional mentoring and coaching during the first two months of its operation. We believe that the CPD is committed to doing what is necessary to make the system a success.

Because the system is not yet in place, the Monitor will defer our compliance determination, but we are very hopeful about this new development.

Status Update

The revised CPOP/SARA problem tracking system went "live" on September 30, 2005. A demonstration was held during the Monitors' visit in October. All of the neighborhood officers and crime analysts have been trained on the new application. Additional training for all District Commanders and Lieutenants will be held the second and third week of December 2005. Usage of the CPOP Case Management System continues to be stressed by the Police Chief and Police Commanders. The Police Relations Section also closely monitors usage of the system.

Item 29(n). The City shall periodically review staffing in light of CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

As we noted in our last Report, the crime analyst profession is quickly coming into its own. The CPD has chosen sworn personnel and is now training them in the basics of crime analysis. We believe that the hiring and training of additional crime analysts is an important step in moving towards a more information-driven department.

The CA requirement for a review of staffing and making necessary revisions goes beyond just having additional crime analysts, however. It requires an assessment of the Department's organization in light of the adoption of problem solving as the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems. The Monitor recognizes that Chief Streicher has initiated a new five-year strategic planning process. The CA outlines the Department's organizational direction and should be a foundation for any new five year strategic plan. We also note that the development of a strategic plan is time consuming and requires a tremendous amount of organizational energy. The CPD should ensure that it continues to focus on fulfilling its already defined responsibilities under the CA, which form the basis for re-establishing trust between Cincinnatians and the police.

Although the Department has now begun training additional officers in crime analysis, the Monitor does not believe this is sufficient to consider the Department in partial compliance. We conclude that the CPD is not in compliance with this subparagraph of the CA.

Status Update

- On September 9, 2005, the Five Year Strategic Planning Committee had its initial meeting with the Police Chief. Chief Streicher discussed his vision and goals for the CPD over the next five years. The committee members have been divided into four teams and were assigned to review the CPD's vision, mission, and value statements. The assignment was to determine if changes should be made based on the CPD's commitment to CPOP.

Committee members met again on October 7, 2005 and November 4, 2005 to discuss possible revisions to the vision, mission, and value statements. Suggestions are currently under review by the Police Chief.

The Strategic Planning Committee teams will discuss the strategic goals of the Police Department. Each team will be assigned a goal. If more than four goals are identified, the teams will be realigned.

The overall goal is to have a five-year plan completed by the first quarter of 2006. The plan will contain the following:

- Vision
 - Mission
 - Value Statements
 - Strategic goals of the Department
 - Operational objectives
 - Anticipated workload
 - Population trends
 - Anticipated personnel levels
 - Capital improvements
 - Equipment needs
 - Provisions for review
 - Revisions as needed
- The new crime analysts participated in an additional 32 hours of “in-house” training at the Police Academy. The CPD Crime Analysts began their monthly meetings. The agendas are attached as Appendix Item # 7.

Item 29(o). The City shall review and, where necessary, revise police departmental policies and procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards, consistent with its commitment to CPOP.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

In our prior two Reports we said that the performance appraisal system should be consistent with the CA and MOA, it should support problem solving, reflect that problem solving is the principal strategy of the Department, and be a means of accountability within the Department. The performance evaluations as they currently stand are not adequate for compliance under this section.

The CPD agrees that the system in place is outdated. What is needed is an acknowledgement that the performance appraisal system must be consistent with the CA and MOA, it should support problem solving, reflect that problem solving is the principal strategy of the Department, and be a means of accountability within the Department.

The City is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

To implement problem solving as the principal strategy of the Department, the Police Relations Section will initiate dialogue with the CPD, the Monitoring Team and Parties in an attempt to clearly define what full compliance with this term means in practice and how it can be attained over time.

The Five-Year Strategic Planning Committee will review the current organizational plans, job descriptions, and police department standards to recommend changes consistent with CPOP. On July 13, 2005, the Police Chief approved a performance evaluation process improvement team (PIT) to fundamentally change the current performance evaluation system the police department is using. The performance evaluation PIT team is a diverse group of police department sworn members of various ranks, gender, and race. Additionally, both the Fraternal Order of Police and Sentinel Police Organization have representatives on the team.

The performance evaluation PIT team had its first meeting on August 18, 2005 to discuss the change process. The goal is to fundamentally change the police department's performance evaluation system for implementation in 2006. The current outdated system of numerically scoring eighteen trait categories is purely subjective with no interaction from the evaluated member. Planning Section has received several contemporary performance evaluation systems used by other police departments throughout the country. The performance evaluation PIT team will develop and submit a new performance evaluation system to the Police Chief later this year with plans to implement the new system in 2006.

Item 29(p). The City shall design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information including repeat offenders, repeat victims, and/or locations.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

In reviewing the system chosen for the CPD, the Monitor will assess whether the system is capable of retrieving and linking information in the CPD's current computers; enables the CPD to track repeat offenders, repeat victims, and repeat locations; whether it is used in problem solving, CPOP cases, District/Unit Commander reports, Planning and Analysis Reports, and Crime Analysis Unit reports; and whether it increases the CPD's ability to identify trends and patterns and use them to undertake problem-solving efforts. While the current systems provide some information, they are systems that are based on old models of policing, where incidents were documented typically as isolated or non-recurrent events, where pattern analysis might focus on an offender "m.o.," rather than also on repeat location, repeat location types, repeat victim, and repeat victimization.

The CPD is not using its current system to this capacity; the CA calls for systems that can do these things.

The City is not in compliance with this CA provision.

Status Update

The CPD staff presented members of the Monitoring team with examples of current analysis functions during their October on-site visit. The visiting Monitoring team members were provided with samples of various types of analysis that have been produced for several different initiatives including the Community Response Teams and targeted quality of life issues for enhanced Code enforcement efforts.

In addition, these types of reports/data production are now more readily accessible in that the department has expanded the number of personnel performing crime analysis functions. Each of the five districts, Criminal Investigations Section and Central Vice Control Section each have in-house crime analysts. The analysts assigned to Planning Section coordinate collection and dissemination of data from entities outside the CPD including other city departments as well as adult and juvenile probation. Information made available from other entities will contribute information for use in various CPOP efforts. The centralized unit also assists in gathering data and producing reports as requested by the Partnering Center or other community led efforts such as the Neighborhood Support Center.

The CPD has also recently been provided access to Juvenile Court Data and will soon expand personnel access to several state databases which will be useful in follow-up investigations and CPOP assessment.

Item 29(q). The City shall secure appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Monitor has not found sufficient evidence of analysis in the projects the CPD has submitted thus far to find the CPD in compliance. In only a few projects is there a mention of the exact number of calls for service for a location and the projects do not include an analysis of the calls and what they suggest about the problem. Many of the problems that CPD is now undertaking in the community likely have been problems for years, repeat locations that are only recently being worked in a fashion that is somewhat different from an incident-driven response. The Monitor believes that it is too soon to assign partial or full compliance to a

system that is not even set. The CPD's revised tracking system is not in place and for two years the Monitor has sought greater detail on specific problem-solving efforts that would show evidence of analysis. While the CPD has selected a vendor and entered into contract negotiations for a new system, compliance cannot be determined until the new system is on firmer ground.

The City is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

The CPD has reached a tentative contract with Motorola to develop and install an integrated Computer Aided Dispatch/Records Management System and anticipates having project kick-off before the end of 2005. Timeline for CAD is 12-18 months and RMS is 18-24 months from project initiation.

Until this project is completed, the CPD will continue to use existing functionality, which was demonstrated to Ms. Sampson and Mr. Brann during their October site visit.

III. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY EVALUATION

Evaluation Protocol

Items 30-46, Evaluation Protocol

Monitor's Previous Assessment

While the components of the Evaluation Protocol are still being implemented by RAND and the Parties, a significant amount of work has been accomplished. The Monitor will work closely with the Parties and RAND to begin the process of evaluating whether the goals of the CA are being achieved.

The Parties are in compliance with the CA provisions requiring the development of a system of evaluation, and a protocol for accomplishing this evaluation. Because the components of the Evaluation Protocol have not yet been implemented, the Parties are not yet in compliance with implementation or with the requirement of public reporting of the results of the Evaluation Protocol. However, we are hopeful that RAND's work on the evaluation project will proceed apace and that implementation will be accomplished.

Status Update

The draft report of the Evaluation of data for years 2003-2004 has been circulated to the parties and the monitor, with comments returned to RAND on November 3, 2005 by the CPD and ACLU. Additionally the parties sent a cover email to RAND regarding several serious issues upon which all of the Parties agreed. The Parties also offered to extend RAND additional time if necessary to produce the product anticipated. According to the remaining timeline RAND will respond with a "Final Report" by November 17, 2005. The parties have until November 28, 2005 to add items for an appendix with the Final Report due to the City December 4, 2005.

On October 11, 2005, the CPD published information regarding RAND Corporation CA sessions in the Staff Notes. The sessions focused on providing the Parties and the general public with information about the evaluation process, methodology, the manner in which the surveys were collected and how the data was analyzed.

The Parties to the CA submitted the following Final Statement in reference to the RAND study:

The Parties to the Collaborative Agreement (CA), the City of Cincinnati, Fraternal Order of Police and the American Civil Liberties Union

(ACLU), together are committed to the specific community-wide goals for improving both policing and police-community relations as identified in the CA. The RAND Corporation was selected to conduct an analysis of data over five years to systematically measure the efforts to achieve these goals. The Parties are committed to community discourse after the release of the first full report in December.

RAND's process includes the opportunity for the Parties to review a draft of the assessment so that the Parties can all ensure that police protocol and procedures are applied accurately. The Parties are looking at the context in which RAND is evaluating the data, as is done with the Monitor's reports. After each of the Parties review the report, each will submit comments separately to RAND and to one another.

This will be the first of four reports issued over five years of data collection. This period will extend beyond the term of the Collaborative Agreement. These reports will serve as the basis for continued dialogue and strategy among the Parties to meet the goals of the Collaborative Agreement.

Virtually nothing has been done to address the issue of community accountability. RAND has not established a viable protocol for evaluating this important aspect of the CA. The RAND report provides no meaningful suggestions for improving community accountability.

IV. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Collaborative Items 47-49

Pointing Firearms Complaints

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The investigations of complaints of improper pointing of firearms from March 2000 to November 2002 were forwarded to the Conciliator, Judge Michael Merz, in July 2003. The Parties also submitted supplementary materials to Judge Merz for his review in making his decision under Paragraph 48. On November 14, 2003 Judge Merz issued his decision. Judge Merz determined that there has not been a pattern of improper pointing of firearms by CPD officers. Therefore, CPD officers will not be required to complete a report when they point their weapon at a person. The Parties are in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 48.

Status Update

The Parties have nothing to report in this area.

V. FAIR, EQUITABLE AND COURTEOUS TREATMENT

Collaborative Items 50-54. The CA requires the Parties to collaborate in ensuring fair, equitable and courteous treatment for all, and the implementation of bias-free policing. Data collection and analysis are pivotal to tracking compliance, and training is essential to inculcate bias-free policing throughout the ranks of the CPD. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, is required to include detailed information regarding bias-free policing in all public reports. The collection and analysis of data to allow reporting on bias-free policing is to be part of an Evaluation Protocol developed with the advice of expert consultants.

A. Data Collection and Analysis

Monitor's Previous Assessment

a. Traffic Stop Data Collection

The CPD is collecting traffic stop data on Contact Cards, which are now being sent to RAND for analysis. RAND is checking quality and consistency of the data fields, and will be preparing its analysis of the data in the next quarter. Because the traffic stop analysis will now be undertaken, the Monitor has determined that the Parties are in compliance with this CA requirement. For continued compliance, the CPD's Records Section will need to continue to input the Contact Cards into its database and provide the data to RAND.

Status Update

The Monitor will recall that the data subject to the first year report is 2003 and 2004 data. The CPD has subsequently implemented additional safeguards to ensure that high quality and accurate information is received by RAND in a timely manner. In addition, since receipt of the draft report, the CPD has reviewed the suggested audit information and is currently implementing additional auditing mechanisms and additional oversights to insure greater compliance. Appropriate action has been taken to address officers who are remiss in submitting the required contact cards.

b. Data Collection

RAND has requested statistical compilations produced by the City for this data. The Parties are not yet fully in compliance with this requirement.

c. Use of Force Racial Data

RAND has requested statistical compilations produced by the City for this data. The Parties are not yet fully in compliance with this requirement.

Status Update

Information requested was provided to RAND and is now analyzed in their draft report.

B. Training and Dissemination of Information

Monitor's Previous Assessment

As we noted in our two Reports, the Monitor has not seen evidence that the Parties are cooperating in ongoing bias-free policing training. Therefore, we cannot find compliance at this time.

Status Update

The CPD Training Section has made inquiries around the country reference bias-free policing training. Information has been received from the state of Maryland, Northwestern University Institute for Public Safety, Institute for Police Technology and Management in Jacksonville, Florida as well as a private program in San Jose, California. Training Section is following up with these programs to determine if they provide any improvements to the CPD's current curriculum.

Bias-free policing training continues to be a part of the police recruit academy curriculum. The 99th Police Recruit Class is scheduled to participate in this training on February 23, 2006.

VI. CITIZEN COMPLAINT AUTHORITY

Collaborative Items 55-89

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Now that the CCA and the CPD have developed written procedures for the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of the CCA and the CPD investigations, the City is in compliance with CA paragraph 74. Also, with these procedures in place, it appears that the City is now able to comply with paragraph 70, requiring that each complaint be directed to the CCA in a timely manner. As reported by the CCA, the City is also now in compliance with CA paragraph 71, requiring that the CPD not interfere with the ability of the CCA to monitor the work of the CPD at the scene, and monitor CPD interviews.

The coordination of the CCA and IIS procedures, and the new SOP setting out procedures for CPD action in those cases where the CCA sustains complaints has also put the City in a position to comply with CA paragraph 78, requiring that the City Manager and the Chief of Police refrain from making a final decision on discipline until after receipt of the CCA investigation and report. The Monitor will be able to assess whether the City is in compliance with this provision in the next quarter.

Status Update

The Regional Computer Center and the CCA are currently in the process of finalizing the Citizen Complaint Case Management System. The Citizen Complaint Case Management System will include the following fields: CCA Case Number, CPD Case Number CPD Date Received, CPD Date Closed, Incident Date, Allegations, Complainant Name, Sex and Race, Officer Name, Sex and Race, CPD Disposition, CCA Disposition, CCA Board action, Date Submitted to City Manager, City Manager's Disposition, and CPD Action. This automated tracking system will replace the current process of coordinating case status information in the current Provue database and the manual processes associated with investigative case management. The Citizen Complaint Case Management System will further enhance CCA's ability to integrate relevant case completion data. In addition, the Case Management System issues addressed previously under ¶¶ 52 and 54 will ensure future deficiencies are eliminated.

During this period, the CCA and CPD have participated jointly in the Management Training Program at the Cincinnati Police Academy. This program provides an opportunity to create awareness for CPD management staff. The training objectives are to:

1. To help supervisors and police officers in doing a better job receiving and handling citizen complaints.
2. Educate supervisors and police officers in the role of the Citizen Complaint Authority
3. Improve the image of the Cincinnati Police Department.
4. Reduce cost and avoid tension and adverse relationships between the citizens and police.
5. Increase respect and public confidence
6. Increase pride and confidence in supervisors and police officers.
7. Understand the difference between civilian oversight and the internal affairs function.
8. To familiarize supervisors and police officers with the process for handling citizen complaints which are within the jurisdiction of the Citizen Complaint Authority.

The RAND report contains some information relating to the limited number of responses by both citizens and police officers relating to their satisfaction with the investigative processes of both the CCA and the CPD. The report does not identify how those responding rated each individual investigative agency. The next such survey should fully identify that name of the complainant, the date of the alleged incident, and the agency being rated by the citizen or police officer. The report should address each individual agency separately.

See Appendix Item #8 to view the CCA's 2004 Annual Report

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

- a. Staff Notes
 - i. Appendix Item # 9
- b. Form 17 – Re: Quarterly Problem-Solving Report Summaries
 - i. Appendix Item #10

APPENDIX

1. List of the Problem Oriented Policing “Best Practices” Library Topics
2. New Supervisors’ Training Topics
3. OSCOR Projects and Assessments
4. CPOP Awards Information
5. Scope of Services for Community Relations Coordinator
6. Quarterly Problem Solving Reports
7. Crime Analysts’ Agendas
8. CCA 2004 Annual Report
9. Staff Notes
10. Form 17: Quarterly Problem-Solving Report Summaries Memo